

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

By this amendment, Claims 1 and 14 are amended. No claims are added or cancelled. Hence, Claims 1-3, 5-16, and 18-26 are pending in the application. No new matter is added. Each issue in the Office action mailed on July 19, 2010 is addressed below.

I. INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Applicants thank Examiner Angela Lie for the courtesy of participating in a telephone interview with Marcel Bingham and Samuel Broda, Applicants' representatives, on October 22, 2010 at 1:00pm EDT. During the interview, the following was discussed: Claim 1 and the reference U.S. Patent 6,879,995 ("Chinta"). No agreement was reached, although Applicants' representatives indicated a reply would be filed.

II. ISSUES RELATING TO PRIOR ART

SUMMARY OF CLAIM REJECTIONS

Claims 1-3, 5-11, 13-16, 18-24, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by Chinta.

Claims 12 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Chinta, in view of U.S. Pat. Pub. 2003/0177187 ("Levine"). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Current Claim 1 recites the following (emphasis added):

A method for determining the usage of space in a database, comprising:
storing, by a first database server, **a first set of space usage data that identifies a first amount of free space remaining in a database for storing additional database data;**
said first database server **making multiple sets of changes to said database, wherein in response to making each set of changes of**

said multiple sets of changes, updating said first set of space usage data;
 retrieving, from one or more second database servers, a second set of **space usage data, that identifies a second amount of free space associated with the database;**
 wherein the first set of space usage data is separate and distinct from the second set of space usage data;
while said first database server is making multiple sets of changes, said second database server making multiple sets of changes to said database, wherein in response to making each set of changes of said multiple sets of changes, updating said second set of space usage data;
 updating the first set of space usage data with the second set of space usage data; and
 evaluating the usage of space in the database based on the updated first set of space usage data,
 wherein the method is performed by one or more computing devices.

Current Claim 14 is the computer-readable medium claim corresponding to current Claim 1.

Current Claim 1 includes the features “a first set of space usage data that identifies a first amount of free space remaining in a database for storing additional database data,” “said first database server making multiple sets of changes to said database, wherein in response to making each set of changes of said multiple sets of changes, updating said first set of space usage data” and “while said first database server is making multiple sets of changes, said second database server making multiple sets of changes to said database, wherein in response to making each set of changes of said multiple sets of changes, updating said second set of space usage data.”

In contrast, nowhere in the handling of out-of-storage-space conditions described by Chinta at Figure 23 and corresponding text at column 39 line 10 through column 40 line 42, is a first set of space usage data that identifies a first amount of free space remaining in a database for storing additional data. Instead, the application servers of Chinta merely periodically checks

for an out-of-storage-space condition (step 502) that does not identify a first amount of free space remaining in a database for storing additional data.

Chinta also fails to disclose or suggest updating said first set of space usage data and updating said second set of space usage data in response to a first database server and a second database server making multiple sets of changes to said database. Instead, Chinta describes the out-of-storage-space condition check made “via a task that wakes up periodically and performs this check.” See column 39 lines 53-55 (emphasis added). Thus Chinta fails to disclose or suggest Applicants’ claimed features quoted above.

The addition of Levine fails to cure the deficiencies of Chinta, as Levine describes the management of collaborative process in a “Grid” system for the design of multi-player gaming applications. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of independent Claims 1 and 14.

III. CONCLUSION

The pending claims not discussed so far are dependent claims that depend on an independent claim that is discussed above. Because each of the dependent claims includes the limitations of claims upon which each dependent claim depends, the dependent claims are patentable for at least those reasons the claims upon which the dependent claims depend are patentable. Removal of the rejections with respect to the dependent claims and allowance of the dependent claims is respectfully requested. In addition, the dependent claims introduce additional limitations that independently render them patentable. Due to the fundamental difference already identified, a separate discussion of those limitations is not included at this time.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Please charge any shortages or credit any overages to Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Date: November 8, 2010

/Samuel S. Broda #54802/

Samuel S. Broda

Reg. No. 54,802

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550
San Jose, CA 95110
Telephone (408) 414-1080
Facsimile: (408) 414-1076